

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 14-16, 19, 22, 23, 25-27, 30, and 31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over US Patent 5,084,870 to Hutchinson et al. (Hutchinson) in view of US Patent Application Publication 2004/0223460 by Eldridge et al. (Eldridge). Claims 3, 6, 21, 24, and 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Hutchinson in view of Eldridge and in further view of US Patent Application Publication 2006/0153562 by Dolbec et al. (Dolbec). Claims 8-13, 17, 18, 28, and 32 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicants thank the Examiner for the guidance in making these amendments during our telephone conversation of April 21, 2009.

### **Amendments to the Claims**

Applicants request that the following amendments be allowed: amending claim 1 with the limitations of claim 8, amending claim 15 with the limitations of claim 17, amending claim 19 with the limitations of claims 26-28, amending claim 30 with the limitations of claim 32, amending claims 9-13 to dependent from claim 1, amending claim 18 to depend from claim 15, and canceling claims 8, 14, 17, 26-28, 31, and 32. The amendments add no new matter.

### **Response to rejections of claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Applicants have amended claim 1 with the limitations of claim 8, claim 15 with the

limitations of claim 17, claim 19 with the limitations of claims 26-28, and claim 30 with the limitations of claim 32. As claims 8, 17, 28, and 32 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims, Applicants submit that claims 1, 15, 19, and 30 are allowable. Applicants further submit that claims 2-7, 9-13, 16, 18, 21-25, and 29 are allowable as depending from allowable claims. Claims 8, 14, 17, 26-28, 31, and 32 are canceled.

#### Conclusion

As a result of the presented remarks, Applicants assert that the application is in condition for prompt allowance. Should additional information be required regarding the traversal of the rejections of the claims enumerated above, Examiner is respectfully asked to notify Applicants of such need. If any impediments to the prompt allowance of the claims can be resolved by a telephone conversation, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

/Brian C. Kunzler/

Brian C. Kunzler

Reg. No. 38,527

Attorney for Applicant

Date: June 8, 2009

8 East Broadway, Suite 600

Salt Lake City, UT 84111

Telephone (801) 994-4646